

their hyphen. Irishmen in Ireland may oppose England to their heart's content, but as Americans it ill becomes them to foment trouble with a former foe. The United States offers the oppressed of other lands an opportunity to achieve a destiny denied them at home; that opportunity should not be used as a base for embroiling us with other nations.

S. C.



Strength Does Not Excuse Injustice.

"We are too big, too powerful, too self-respecting a nation to interpret with too strained or refined a reading the words of our own—promises just because we have power enough to reach them as we please." In preaching this doctrine of common honesty in international dealing President Wilson performed a valuable service that will have consequences extending beyond his own official term. It applies to many other questions than that of Panama tolls. For it is a fact that we have on certain occasions in the past interpreted "with too strained or refined a reading the words of our own promises," and have done so "just because we had power enough to read them as we pleased." That was done with the Filipinos and many times also with Indian tribes. Even in the case of Cuba we hedged on our promise of independence by compelling addition of the Platt amendment to her constitution. Those who then urged the policy of honesty were sneered at as possessors of "super-heated consciences." President Wilson has established a precedent that should never be violated. In different words he has proclaimed a sentiment which years ago another stated as follows: "That we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us. That we should respect the rights of others as scrupulously as we would have our own rights respected, is not a mere counsel of perfection to individuals, but it is the law to which we must conform social institutions and national policy if we would secure the blessings of abundance and peace."

S. D.



Real Bravery.

Lest the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission should overlook a deserving aspirant, The Public would call its attention to the case of William J. Calhoun, of Chicago. At the Swedish-American banquet, to mark Ericsson Day, Mr. Calhoun said: "As a result of Democratic free trade policies we are today eating corn and butter from Argentina and oats from Canada, while our own farmers are unable to get a fair price for their produce. . . .

The hope of the nation lies in policies which will protect our industries at home and enable us to find markets abroad. In other words, the hope of the nation is in the Republican party." It is submitted in all fairness that a man who can rise in the presence of 500 banqueters, with representatives of the press present, and give utterance to such words is worthy of something more than a place at the board.

S. C.



Brazil in Trouble.

It is too soon to pass upon the underlying causes of the revolt in Brazil, or to hazard a prediction as to the probable outcome. Enough is known, however, to warrant the fear that troublesome times are ahead. Race conflicts are given as one cause, and financial stress following the failure of the government to carry through its plan of state aid to the coffee and rubber industries. That a nation able to emancipate its slaves without war, and without compensation to the owners, should now suffer from social disturbances, is unfortunate; but when it is realized that the races in Brazil have lacked that great melting-pot that has saved this country—the public school—small wonder need be felt at increasing disturbances in so large a territory, with such separate and distinct colonization as that of the Germans and Japanese, added to the already mixed population of Portuguese, Spaniards, Negroes, and natives. The naval revolt in November, 1910, a few days after the inauguration of President Fonseca, when the crews of eight of the principal ships in the harbor of Rio de Janeiro dictated terms to the government, indicates a lack of political coherence.



The valorization scheme of the government was foredoomed to failure. and the present financial stress should cause no surprise. Attempts to maintain prices by buying at a certain minimum price are just as impracticable as the maintenance of prosperity and high wages by means of protective tariffs. And Brazilian statesmen, like some American statesmen, have yet to learn that commerce moves in obedience to laws as inexorable as the gravity that controls the flow of water. The stream may be dammed, but sooner or later the water will overflow. Brazil did relieve the coffee growers by buying and storing coffee when it fell below a certain price, but assured profits merely stimulated further coffee planting; and the time soon came when the stock accumulated in the glutted market could not be worked off between seasons. Even had the government succeeded in restrict-

ing the planting of new plantations in Brazil, it would have been unable to control the industry in Mexico, Central America, Java, or any other coffee country. The same was true of the rubber industry. Men cannot lift themselves by pulling on their boot straps, even in Brazil. S. C.



Mexico and the Philippines.

Former President Taft in endorsing President Wilson's Mexican policy gives sound reasons therefor, based altogether on considerations of expediency. It is a pity that Mr. Taft has never realized that these same reasons make immediate withdrawal from the Philippines the policy of wisdom, to say nothing of the moral principles involved. Imperialism is everywhere a bad business proposition. S. D.



A Protest Which Congress Should Heed.

A strong protest against expenditure of \$56,000,000 for four battleships has been sent to Congress by a committee of prominent women, including Lucia Ames Mead, Mary E. Woolley, Jane Addams, Ida M. Tarbell, and others. The reasons given in this protest are powerful ones and will not be without effect if Congressmen will pay some attention to the merits of the proposition under consideration. They call attention to the selfish motive of the naval officers who urge such expenditures, to the fact that the reasons they offer are only fantastic possibilities not reasonable probabilities, to the fact that we have never asked any nation to arbitrate and been refused, that our only war in 100 years with other than an American power has been the Spanish war which we ourselves started, and to the further fact that we were never attacked when we had a small navy, and we maintained the Monroe doctrine, in 1895, nevertheless. The protest shows that Japan, which is usually portrayed as the greatest menace, knows that a war with us would be national suicide. Strongest and most impressive of the reasons given is the following:

"One can never tell what the case may be a year hence," said one of the admirals. Alas, we can surely tell that a year hence another long roll of victims, numbering about as many as perished in four years of the Civil War, will have died because of our folly in putting our greatest defense where it is least needed, leaving our greatest needs unremedied. The yearly cost of our national Children's Bureau, which is trying to prevent our awful infant mortality, is less than the annual

repairs on two torpedo boat destroyers. Let us indeed 'be prepared'; but let us prepare for our certain, definite foes and call a halt on the increase of defense against the bugaboos conjured up by timid visionaries."



This protest ought not to fall on deaf ears. The Congressman must be utterly lacking in patriotism who in order to promote the building of destructive engines of war will block the taking of effective measures to prevent needless loss of life. S. D.



Who Is Responsible?

Responsibility for the mutilation, in the interest of Washington land speculators, of Congressman Henry George's bill, is attributed by the correspondent of the Philadelphia North American in the issue of March 6 to Congressman Ben Johnson of Kentucky, Chairman of the District of Columbia Committee. The charge seems unbelievable. But whether Mr. Johnson is the one responsible or not a majority of the District committee must be. Members who can not clear their record on this matter should be borne in mind by their democratic constituents this fall. S. D.



"Unfit to Be Voted On."

"Unfit to be voted on." In this way the New York Times of February 12 characterizes the proposition embodied in the Herrick-Schaap bill for a popular referendum on the question of cutting in half the tax rate on buildings. In this the Times speaks for the Allied Real Estate Interests, The Citizens' Union, and all other plutocratic interests that wish to continue reaping where others have sown. If the approval of these interests must first be obtained before the popular will on any measure may be expressed there never will be any expression that may lead to possible consequences. In this matter the New York Times openly admits—what progressives have long known to be the case—that it and the interests for whom it speaks are opposed to popular government. They have no objection to the form—in fact, they probably like it—but they do object to the substance.



Another fact is also made clear. The proposition to halve the tax on buildings is one to relieve congestion, one that will do something to remove the cause of tuberculosis, reduce the frightful percentage of infant mortality that prevails on the